

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Christopher L. Spencer,)	C.A. #4:03-0420-PMD
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	
Officer NFN Dowey, Officer NFN Riley,)	
and Officer NFN White, Law Enforcement)	
for Kershaw County,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that the defendants' motion for summary judgment be denied. The record includes the report and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge made in accordance with this Court's Order of Reference and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Because plaintiff was pro se, this matter was referred to the magistrate judge.¹

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). No objections have been filed to the magistrate judge's report.

A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this

¹Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28 United States Code, § 636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in cases filed under Title 42 United States Code, § 1983, and submit findings and recommendations to this Court.

case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the magistrate judge, it is **ordered** that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is **DENIED**.

FURTHER ORDERED, that the magistrate judge's report and recommendation is adopted as the order of this Court.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.


PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY
United States District Judge

Charleston, South Carolina
August 16, 2005